THE PUBLICATION-DATE OF NUTTALL'S "ARKANSAS FLORA"

Robert C. Foster

In the decade following 1830, there was a noticeable rivalry between the Botanical Magazine and the Botanical Register in figuring and describing new North American plants grown from seeds sent to England by Douglas and Drummond. During this period, Nuttall published his long and important treatment of the Arkansas flora. Since there is the possibility of competition between Nuttall's work and that based on Drummond's collections, it seems desirable to establish, as exactly as possible, the publication-date of Nuttall's paper.

Nuttall's "Collections towards a Flora of the Territory of Arkansas", read before the American Philosophical Society on April 4, 1834, appeared in that Society's Transactions, vol. v. 139–203, the publication-date for the entire volume being given as 1837.

The Transactions appear to have been published in parts, each containing twenty-six four-page signatures. Nuttall's paper began on the third page of V-2K, ended on the third page of V-3A, and was certainly completely published before 1837.

In his Comp. Bot. Mag. i. 14 (Aug. 1, 1835), Hooker referred to Nuttall's work, saying "In the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society he has commenced his 'Collections towards a Flora of the Territory of Arkansas.'" Hooker noted several points, ending with a summary of the uses of *Cyamus luteus*, given on p. 160 of volume v. It is clear that, if Hooker's periodical appeared on or near the date given for its publication, at least pp. 139–160 of this volume of the Transactions had been issued some time before August 1, 1835. Sprague, in Kew Bull. 1933: 362–364, indicates that Hooker's date is substantially correct, since this portion of the Companion was issued with the August number of the Botanical Magazine.

In Bot. Mag. lxiii. t. 3465 (Feb. 1, 1836), the text accompanying the figure of *Pentstemon Cobaea* Nutt. cited the original place of publication, p. 182 of volume v. of the Transactions, this being the second page of signature 2V, the signature ending with p. 184. The relative slowness of communications at that time

makes it highly improbable that a paper published after Jan. 1, 1836, in this country, could be available for citation in England by Feb. 1, 1836, or shortly afterward.

To summarize: it seems a justifiable assumption that pp. 139–184, at least, had been issued by the end of 1835, and that the remainder, pp. 185–203, appeared in early 1836. It is beyond question that pp. 139–160 were issued by or soon after the middle of 1835. In any case, the date, 1837, usually given in citing species described in this work, is certainly incorrect.

GRAY HERBARIUM.

THE GREAT SMOKIES AND THE BLUE RIDGE.—This is a succeeding volume[1] to the "Friendly Mountains" which dealt with the climate, natural history, customs, and scenery of the White, Green, and Adirondack Mountains. Likewise this volume is designed to bring to the general reader a feeling and interest in the southern mountains. Botanically this is accomplished by three chapters contributed by Donald Culross Peattie and a chapter "Through the Year in the Great Smoky Mountains" by the park naturalist, Arthur Stupka. It was my privilege to climb LeConte in 1930 with Sharp, Cain, and Underwood, and to drive up—and especially down—the ramshackle dirt road, which at that time went no farther than Indian Gap. How the highway has changed! A modern concrete road with tunnels and turnouts has sprung up in its place. And in succeeding years I made extensive trips with Jennison—the last one into the relatively unknown Greenbrier section. So it was especially interesting to have Stupka mention the conspicuous shadbush trees (*Amelanchier*) which reach an enormous size at the summits of the mountains, occupying an altitudinal range (900–6400 ft.) greater than that of any other tree in the Smokies. Though the Great Smokies have on their summits many trees characteristic of the mountain-tops of New England, something seems strange about the trunk and bark and makes them difficult to recognize. This I believe is due to the unusually moist conditions which are encountered; the upland forests have the wet mossy look of those in Ireland or in parts of the Scandinavian Peninsula rather than of New England. The Great Smokies are not as interesting botanically as the Cumberlands to the westward, but the lesser variety of species is probably compensated by the elaborate display of azaleas and rhododendrons. Perhaps the pall of clouds which hangs over the Smokies for so much of the year tends to discourage the growth of sun-loving plants.

There is still much controversy as to the origin of balds, which occur as either grassy or ericaceous formations, and (p. 154) these are mentioned as probably due to evaporation resulting from altitude and exposure to winds. It has always seemed to me—but this is only an opinion—that the great variability in the composition of the rocks from one locality to another, even in the same ridge, may be the thing of fundamental importance.

It is easy to fall into generalizations when the only available sources are none too accurate. The many bad smells (p. 174) attributed to the vegetation of the Galapagos Islands are due—so far as I am aware—to only a single species, *Lantana pedunculata*, which thrusts the odor of naphthalene into an atmosphere already suffocatingly oppressive. But this is true only along the

[1] *The Great Smokies and the Blue Ridge.* **Edited by Roderick Peattie. 384 pp., illustrated. Vanguard Press, N. Y. $3.75.**